[Shri Yogendra Makwana] English and Hindi) of the following papers: —

(i) Annual Report and Audited Accounts of the Central Council for Research in Homoeopathy, New Delhi, for the year 1983-84.

(ii) Review by Government on the working of the Council.

(iii) Statement giving reasons for the delay in laying the papers mentioned at (i) above. [Placed in Library. *See* No. LT-1276|85 for (i) to (iii) .]

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPOETANCE

Nuclear threat faced by India in the context of the reported move of Pakistan to acquirt and develop nuclear weapons

SHRI J. K. JAIN (Madhya Pradesh) Mr. Chairman, Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the nuclear threat faced by the country in the context of the reported move of Pakistan to acquire and develop nuclear weapons and the steps taken by Government in the matter.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN): Mr. Chairman, Sir, _____

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, this Calling Attention should have been dealt with by the Defence Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is fo$_r$ the Government to decide who will deal with it and the Government have decided that the Minister of External Affairs will deal with it. Yes, Mr. Khurshid Mam Khan.

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: Sir, the non-peaceful dimension of ^{3}akistan's nuclear programme has >een a matter of concern for India.

Contrary to the claims by Pakistan's leaders, available evidence and public statements by Pakistan scientists suggest that Pakistan has been pursuing the objective of acquiring the wherewithal to manufacture nuclear weapons. Reports which have appeared from time to time jn the international media in this regard, particularly about the clandestine procurement of nuclear equipment and components by Pakistan, have reinforced our apprehensions.

2. Our concerns on this subject which have been conveyed on differ ent occasions to the Government of Pakistan at various levels were rei terated during the recent visit of the Foreign Secretary of Pakistan.

3. Government are concerned at the likelihood of Pakistan acquiring nuclear weapons which would result in qualitative change in the security environment in our region. India remains committed to developing nuclear technology for peaceful pur poses. However, we cannot but take into account these developments in our neighbourhood which have grave implications for our security. I wish to assure the House that Government have been keeping, and will continue to keep, a constant vigil on all deve lopments having a bearing on the country's security.

श्री जे० के० जैन : सभापति महोदय, हम पास्ट में भी कई बार सुन चुके हैं कि हमारी सरकार ने पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ कन्सर्न शो किया है और आज भी हमारी कुशल मंत्री महोदय ने वही बातें अपने स्टेटमेंट में रखी हैं कि पाकिस्तान की इन गतिविधियों के ऊपर भारत सरकार अपना कंसर्न शो कर चुकी है और एक बार फिर किया है ? एक ओर हम कंसर्न शो कर रहे हैं और दूसरी ओर पाकिस्तान बराबर तीव्र गति से न्यूक्लियर आर्म्स बनाने की ओर बढ़ रहा है । यह बहुत चिंता का विषय बन चुका है ।

समापति महोदय, अभी कल ही की बात है आप भी उस हिरोशिमा दिवस के समारोह में उपस्थित थे, सारे देश में, सारे विश्व में जब हिरोशिमा और नागाशाकी के उस हत्याकांड का और बम काण्ड की कहानियां बच्चे और बड़े सुनते हैं, पढ़ते हैं, तो उनके रोंगटे खड़े हो जाते हैं, आपका भी कंसर्न इस बारे में शो करना वाजिब बात थी । अध्यक्ष महोदय, पाकिस्तान की नियत कुछ और है । वह दिखा कुछ और रहे है और कर कुछ और रहे है । एक ओर हमारे देश की सरकार को वह बातों में उलझा रहे हैं, अपने डेलीगेशन भेज देते हैं, कभी विदेश सचिव अपने भेज देते हैं जो मीठी चुपड़ी बातें कर जाते हैं और दूसरी ओर यह इतना भयानक कार्य करने से भी बाज नहीं आ रहे हैं । हमें इस बारे में कुछ करना होगा ।

समापति महोदय, मुझे इस बात की प्रसन्नता है यह कहते हुये कि हमारे माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जब अमरीका की यात्रा पर गये, तो उन्होंने वहां के राष्ट्रपति श्री रीगन से स्पष्ट शब्दों में कहा कि अमरीका को यह चाहिये कि वह पाकिस्तान को न्यूक्लियर आर्म्स बनाने से रोके और अमरीका ने इसका आश्वासन भी दिया । लेकिन अभी पाकिस्तान के तानाशाह श्री जियाउल हक ने अपने एक बयान में कहा कि कि हम अमरीका के किसी दबाव में नहीं आ सकते । इस बात से यह भी साफ जाहिर होता है कि यह साजिश बड़ी जबरदस्त है । पाकिस्तान का खुलेआम यह कहना कि हम अमरीका के दबाव में नहीं आ सकते, मुझे लगता है कि अमरीका के पिट्ठू ही यह बात कहलवा रहे हैं क्योंकि यह जगत विदित है, सर्व-विदित है कि पाकिस्तान अमरीका का एक पिट्ठू बन चुका है । हम अमरीकी राष्ट्रपति रीगन से इस आश्वासन को भी नहीं मान सकते हैं क्योंकि एक ओर तो अमरीकी राष्ट्रपति आश्वासन देते हैं कि हम पाकिस्तान को न्यूक्लीयर आर्म्स बनाने से रोकेंगे और दूसरी ओर एफ०–16 की दूसरी खेप देने की तैयारी की जा रही है । एफ०–16 क्या है ? इस बारे में हमारे तकनीशियनों ने भी और सारे विश्व के वैज्ञानिकों ने कहा है कि एफ०–16 विमान का उपयोग अणु बम को छोड़ने के लिए ही किया जा सकता है । तो एक ओर तो दूसरी खेप का देना और दूसरी ओर पाकिस्तान के द्वारा ट्रेगर टेस्ट करना, यह बिल्कुल साफ जाहिर होता हैं कि पाकिस्तान की तैयारी भारत के साथ अणु युद्ध करने की बहुत तेजी से चल रहा है ।

समापति महोदय, आज सारे देश में एक भय का वातावरण बना हुआ है। हर बच्चा, बड़ा, बूढ़ा नागरिक इस बात से त्रस्त है कि क्या पाकिस्तान का हिन्दुस्तान के साथ अणु–युद्ध छेड़ देगा । उस हालत में हिन्दुस्तान का क्या हाल होगा ? क्या हम शांतिपूर्ण वातावरण चाहने वालों से यह दिखावे के लिए लोग हमारे देश में आते हैं ? एक ओर शांति की वार्ता करते हैं और दूसरी ओर अणु युद्ध की तैयारी कर रहे हैं । हमको सोचना होगा ; यद्यपि हम अणु-बम, अणु-हथियार बनाने के सख्त विरोधी हैं, लेकिन यदि हमारे पड़ोसी देश इस प्रकार के हथियारों का निर्माण कर लें, अणु-बम तैयार कर लें तो क्या हम किंकर्तव्यमूढ़ होकर ही इन सब बातों को देखते रहेंगे ?

समापति महोदय, आज यह बातें चिंता का विषय बन चुकी है । अभी जो पाकिस्तान का कोहता न्यूक्लीयर कांप्लेक्स है, उसके जो निर्माता है, श्री ए० के० खान, उनको कितना दम है, उन्होंने एक इंटरव्यू में जो हर मंथ पत्रिका छपती है पाकिस्तान में, और जिसका पुनः प्रकाशन यहां स्टेटिस्टिक्स गाइड में किया गया, वह इतने अभिमान के साथ कहते हैं :—

"Dr. Sethn$_a$ and myself could sit across the table in, the presence of the experts' team and leave it to the experts to decide who is more capable in this field. I $_a$m sure he will not be able to match any one of my colleagues even."

इससे बिल्कुल साफ जाहिर होता है कि इसके पीछे वह अमरीकी ताकतें और वह चीनी ताकतें मौजूद हैं जो बराबर इस

matter of Urgent

[श्री जे० के० जैन]

को इस विज्ञान और तकनीक की शिक्षा दे रहीं हैं और भड़का रही हैं कि इस तरह के बयान बराबर दिये जायें और जिससे हमारे देश के नागरिकों को डिमारेलाइज किया जाये । आज जो यह त्रिगुट बना है 20 बिलियन डालर की जो सहायता अमरीका ने चीन को दी है, सभापति महोदय, यह एक संदेह का मामला है । यह चीन को दी जाने वाली 20 बिलियन डालर की सहायता यह क्या चीन के लिए है । अमरीका निःसन्देह चीन के अ पाकिस्तान को यह सारी चीजें सप्लाई करवा रहा है और यह जो ट्रिगर टेस्ट हुआ, मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि भारत सरकार की जो खुफिया एजेंसीज है इसके लिये वह क्या कर रही है । मैं भारत सरकार से और अपने मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या उनको इस बात की जानकारी है कि कौन से ऐसे देश है जो इस तरह की तकनीक और इस तरह की मदद पाकिस्तान को चोरी से दे रहे है तो क्या हम ऐसे मुल्कों के साथ अपने सम्बन्ध बना कर रखना चाहते है जो एक ओर शान्ति का नारा देते हैं और दूसरी ओर हमारे देश को विनाश की ओर पहुंचाने की साजिश कर रहे हैं ?

कुछ प्रश्न इन बातों से उठते हैं । अमरीका ने हमारे प्रधान मंत्री को जो आश्वासन दिया कि वह पाकिस्तान को परमाणु हथियार बनाने से रोकेगा, तो मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि इस ओर क्या डेवलपमेंट हुआ है ? क्या भारत सरकार ने कुछ खतोकिताब अमरीकी राष्ट्रपति से की कि जो आश्वासन अमरीका ने दिया है उसके बारे में उसने पाकिस्तान के साथ क्या बातचीत की और जिया साहब का जो बयान था कि जिसमें उन्होंने साफ कहा था कि हम अमरीका के दबाव में नहीं आने वाले हैं, तो भारत सरकार ने इस बारे में कोई करस्पांडेंस की है ? और क्या आपको अमरीकी सरकार से या अमरीकी राष्ट्रपति से कोई उत्तर प्राप्त हुआ है ? पाकिस्तान की मंशा भारत के साथ परमाणु युद्ध छेड़ने की है। अमरीकी दो मुंही बातें करके भारत को गफलत में रख रहे हैं। 6 अगस्त, को सारे भारत में हिरोशिमा दिवस मना कर हम लोगों ने अणु बम के प्रयोग की जबरदस्त निन्दा की । हम जानना चाहते हैं कि इस प्रकार से जो विनाश के हथियार हमारे पड़ोस के देश में बन रहे हैं उस ओर भारतवर्ष का क्या रुख है और उसके मुकाबले के लिए किस प्रकार से हम लोग प्रयास कर रहे है ? उसकी क्या नीति है यह भारत का हर निवासी जानना चाहता है ।

हम परमाणु बम बेशक न बनायें लेकिन क्या हम परमाणु बम बनाने में सक्षम हैं ? यदि नहीं, तो क्या उपाय है कि जिनसे हमारे देशवासियों को आश्वस्त किया जा सकता है ? यदि पाकिस्तान ने अणु बम बना लिया—क्योंकि यदि ट्रिगर टेस्ट हो जाता है तो उसके बाद यह जरूरी नहीं कि अणुबम का विस्फोट किया जाये, उसकी आवश्यकता नहीं हुआ करती है उसके बाद । तो मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि माननीय मंत्री जी से कि हमारा देश उस स्थिति में भी है या नहीं ? यह मामला बहुत गंभीर मामला हैं क्योंकि अभी तक हमने जो अपने देश की सुरक्षा के लिए तैयारियां कर रखी है वह अणुबम बनाने के बाद इन हथियारों की इजाद होने के बाद और पाकिस्तान के पास अणुबम हो जाने के बाद बेकार हो जाती हैं और उन तैयारियों का कोई मकसद नहीं रह जाता है । इससे कुछ होने वाला नहीं है । युद्ध होने पर हम हाथ पर हाथ रख कर बैठे रह जायेंगे और पाकिस्तान किसी वक्त भी अणु युद्ध छेड़ सकता है आज पाकिस्तान की वह हालत है कि जैसे किसी बन्दर के हाथ में उस्तरा आ गया हो । उसको नहीं मालूम कि उस उस्तरे का प्रयोग वह किस प्रकार करे । पाकिस्तान के अन्दर वह तानाशाही सरकार, जिया की सरकार अपनी गद्दी की सुरक्षा करने के लिए अपने देशवासियों का ध्यान और सारे विश्व का ध्यान इस तरह से भड़का कर दूसरी तरफ ले जाना चाहती है ; हम को यह प्रयास करना होगा कि आज भारत की सीमा पर जो चारों तरफ हमको तानाशाही शासन दिखाई दे रहा

है, हमारी सरकार को प्रयास करना चाहिये कि उन मुल्कों के अन्दर वह प्रजातंत्र की स्थापना के लिए कुछ कदम उठाये वह कौन से कदम इसके लिए उठा रही है यह मैं जानना चाहता हूं । हमको अपने प्रजातन्त्र की और अपने देश की रक्षा के लिए हर कदम उठाना होगा । प्रजातंत्र की रक्षा के लिए हम कमिटेड हैं और यदि किसी देश के अन्दर इस प्रकार की तानाशाही चल रही है और उस तानाशाही के माध्यम से वह हमारे मुल्क को दबाना चाहते हैं तो मैं भारत सरकार से आपके माध्यम से निवेदन कराना चाहता हूं कि जिन मुल्कों में ऐसी तानाशाही और साम्राज्यवाद की स्थापना है उन मुल्कों में प्रजातन्त्र की स्थापना कराने में आप कोई कोर कसर न उठा रखें, । धन्यवाद ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Jaswant Singh.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Chairman, Sir...I will wait for the Deputy Chairman to occupy the Chair.

The Deputy Chairman in the Chair.

Madam, it would have been far preferable if the two members of the Cabinet whose pronouncements on this subject have caused the greatest confusion were present in the House and had handled this debate. However, it is the Government's prerogative to decide who should handle the subject. But the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister have been speaking in two separate, two contradictory voices on this subject and ideally, if it was to be handled by the Ministry of External Affairs, it would have been preferable if the Prime Minister were here to answer questions, as more confusion has been spread on this question of nuclear response of the country by the Prime Minister's statements than by those of any other single member of the Cabinet. This debate is a direct fall out of that confusion. It is a fall out of our serious concern at the most serious question faced by the country's security interests.

Before *we* come to analysing what have been the consequences of the Government's contradictory and confused statements on the subject, or analysing why they have said what they have said, there is need. Madam, to reiterate some principles which are inviolate principles of public pronouncements on issues of high national interest. Firstly, whatever the Government says on matters connected with national security, the message inherent in that statement. should not be uncertain. Secodnly. it must clearly define the threat to the nation and equally clearly voice the national resolve to combat it. Thirdly, premature, exaggerated, contradictory statements about threats being faced by the country have the opposite of the intended effect. They spread alarm at home and confusion abroad. Fourthly, any policy pronouncements on issues concerning the country's secuirty must be made seriously, and more particularly about nuclear policy made only seriously and nothing else. Finally. Madam, that being almost an inviolate law of public pronouncements, if therefore you employ the card of nuclear threat to the country i-epeatedly, in a confusingly contradictory manner, or as a diplomatic ploy for possible use, for possible leverage, then you take away both credibility from the Governments pronouncements and the seriousness of policy issues which must be inherent in them.

Now we need to examine, by just taking a minute, the Governments track record on the subject. An August 22. 1984, the last Prime Minister told the Lok Sabha that "Pakistan's possessing a nuclear bomb does not make a big difference since China and other countries already possess these weapons." On January 11, 1985, within the voting of the new Government, the new Prime Minister says that if Pakistan made the bomb, Indo-Pak

[Jaswant Singh] relations would be "irretrievable". There is a considerable movement between August, 1984 and January, 1985 in the Government's position. We welcome that movement. We would have welcomed it even more had the Prime Minister been consistent and struck to that stand. Just 18 days later, on January 29, he says, "we will never make nuclear weapons even though we have had the capability for the last eleven years. A month later, just under a month later, he says, "Just the fact that Pakistan made a bomb would not make Us change our policy. We do not want to become the same as others. On April, 22 he says something similar. On June 3, 1985 he made an even more categorical statement. The Prime Minister goes on to say, "We think thai they are very near to having a bomb or already have one, in fact, more than one. We have riot made any decision to develop such a bomb. But we are thinking[1] about it. If we should take a decision to become one (by which he meant nuclear power) it would be a matter of a few weeks or a few months. On June 10, 1985, really between June, 10 and 16, during his foreign visit, the Prime Minister says. "It will be difficult for Us not to come out with some kind of a counter to it, counter to Pakistan" . At a press conference on July 7, the Prime Minister says, "Pakistan has a programme for making nuclear weapons." He goes on further to say, "It is clearly close to making them. Then he says, "If it does, India will have to react in some manner."

This is the record of the Government which has moved from "Never, to "May be" "We will react in some way." What is the sum total of all this? The sum total of all this is to spread confusion, spread alarm and to create uncertainty both internally and externally. It is my sad duty that because of such conrta-diceory sta*em+e st that have been made inside this House, I have had to move a motion of privilege against a Minister for whom I have high personal regard. The Defence Minister has made a statement inside this House saying, "From France we face no difficuly. As far as the French-Pakistani nuclear co-operation is concerned, the whole matter had ended in 1978." The Prime Minister, the very next day, on July 23, makes a statement that it is a matter of highest concern. The Defence Minister says that there is no concern as far as France is concerned. The very next day the Prime Minister says that it is a matter of utmost concern. It has been my painful duty, on account of this contradictory stand on the same subject to move a motion of privilege about that at a different time.

Now, about threat assessment, another conclusion that one draws from the Government's repeatedly contradictory statements, is that threat assessment, in (he context of nuclear threats faced by the country, is limited to Pakistan. I accept the fact that this particular Calling Attention is limited to Pakistan. My own Calling Attention was different. I also accept the fact, Madam, that any threat assessment has to be based on and will be dependant upon an assessment of the nature of the political relationship existing between two countries. Pakistan, we treat, differently as a potential threat. France and UK, both nuclear powers, are neighbours. Yet, they do not see one another as potentially nuclear . rivals.

What is the other aspect of the Government's stand on the nuclear policy? We And that as far as our response is concerned, it is marked by three or four significant aspects. We have accepted the presence, all around us, of the People's Republic of Chim of the United States, of the Soviet Union, of Great Britain which is a nuclear power and hag bases in the Indian Ocean, of France which is a nuclear power and is present in the Indian Ocean. The Government utterances make us believe that they

would like to react only to Pakistan. I would go along with that if the Government made their stand clear.

Secondly, what is the nature of the interpretation that we can lend to the Government's pronouncements on it? We have announced peaceful uses of nuelear energy as our policy. We have adopted, it as a vital foreign political policy plank as also a vital foreign economic policy plank. If you now assess Pakistan as a nuclear potential threat to us, what happens to this plank, which is a vital plank of the Government of India? I think !he most difficult aspect of the Government's pronouncement on the subject is to accept that this debate limited to capability—whether Pakistan has the capability to go nuclear or we have the capability to go nuclear. Madam, I submit that the debate is no longer limited to capability.

When a student of Princeton University, based on published material, in a laboratory can manufacture a device which is similar to a nuclear device, I work on the thesis that all countries today have, potentially, the ability to nuclearise themselves. I think today 35 countries are already nuclear. The debate between Pakistan and India is no longer about the capability. The debate essentially is how those capabilities are to be harnessed—how those capabilities are to be utilised. That is where the Government's pronouncements continue to be vague and confusing. This has resulted in the Government of India adopting' ambiguity in nuclear policy. The statement of the Honourable Minister is a classic example of that ambiguity and what it is all about. Let us in a brief moment, examine the parameters and perils of ambiguity in nuclear policy. The first option is the possibility of security or deterrence by pretence—we will not have a bomb, but We will pretend to have a bomb so that it will result in deterrence. The flaws in such policies are obvious enough.

The second aspect which flows from such ambiguous nuclear policy is security by deception or deterrence by deception: we will have a bomb, but we will pretend we don't have a bomb—and if anybody makes the mistake of striking at us. then we will retaliate. Thus our security is reduced to a retaliatory capacity.

The third aspect is the "deterrent classic', that we will work towards a mutually assured deterrent (MAD). I am unable to wpi*k out from the ambiguity of the Government's pronouncement as to what is the Government policy on this question. It is on this particular subject that I have one more difficulty. Since January, 1985, this Government and the present Prime Minister have made more statements on the nuclear issue than on any other single issue. (Time bell *rings)* Each of those statements , is contradictory to the previous one. When it was a question of taking up the possibility of Pakistan going nuclear then, we pointed erroneously— and we emphasised the conventional rearming of that country. We were diplomatically unable to stop the conventional rearming of Pakistan. When that rearming process was almost complete since January, 1985, we have started talking of the increasing nuclear threat from Pakistan. Indian diplomacy thus stands faulted on both accounts. We have failed to prevent Pakistan in its conventional rearmament programme. Now, that having been completed, we are now taking up the question of the inevitable consequence of such a conventional rearmament programme, which would have come into being their nuclear programme. Madam, we have had enough. You have enough of hearing me.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Exactly.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH; I will conclude by asking my question. Before I do so. I want to say political ineptitude has cost this nation very dearly.

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

If you examine the conflict of 1948 or of 1352 or of 1965 or of 1971, ' when all the diplomatic and military cards were in our favour, you will sec that what was achieved militarily was lost because of political and diplomatic ineptitude. Let that ineptitude, let that political and diplomatic ineptitude, not be repeated when it comes to a matter of as high an importance as our nuclear response to a possible nuclear threat. I would, therefore, ask the honourable Minister to state clearly—and that is why I started by saying that it is the Prime Minister who should have been present here because, I repeat, that it is his statements which have caused greater confuaion on the subject than that of any other single member of his Cabinet—what the nuclear threal is which is facing the country today and what our response to it is. Would he state clearly that a non-nuclear 1idia-Pakistan in possible or is not possible? If that is not possible, if a non-nuclear India-Pakistan is not possible, if it is said that it is too late or that it is not worthwhile in your appreciation or your policy pronouncements, then what are you doing to safeguard India's national interest? I would like to ask three or four other specific questions and I would request the honourable Minister to reply to them clearly.

Now, Madam, the NPT review is taking place from the 27th of August in Geneve. In this NPT review that is taking place, what is going to be the Government of Indiia's stand and what *U* goin^ to be the c,tand of the Non-Aligned? Who is going to represent the Non-aligned? Would India he attending even as an observer? Now, the next thins; is the. New Delhi Declaration of 1983, repeated subsequently by the Prime Minister and 5 other Heads of Governments. What is the relevance of the 1983 New Delhi Declaration to the Government's repeated pronouncements on nuclear questions since January. 1985? Does the Government stand by the New Delhi Declaration or does it stand by it;i other pronouncements? What is the Government's information on the as-e provided to Pakistan by Libya? Would the Government deny or confirm that following upon Israel's attack on the Osirak nuclear reactor, Libya had offered Pakistan 1500 million dollars in exchange for supply of enrieted uranium and it undertook to contribute towards Pakistan's nuclear programme, that Libya has already paid around 500 million dollars, partly to Niger and partly to Pakistan and. finally, that Libya has also pro-mifed to finance a sophisticated antiaircraft system in Pakistan so that Osirak cannot be repeated? Would the Government of India give us or share with us its information on the •abject?

Now, the next point is about Pakistan's co-operation with Niger. Niger has publicly announced sale of roughly about 450 tonnes of uranium or "yellow cake". Would the Government of India confirm or deny this? Then, the People's Republic of China: The Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of Externa! Affairs again speak in contradictory terms of what assistance is being provided by the People's Republic of China to Pakistan. I have, in a reply from the Prime Minister, a confirmation that the People's Republic of China have a nuclear co-operation programme with Pakistan. The Defence Ministry has told me that they do not have. Would now, therefore, the Ministry of External Affairs confirm that there is a programme of cooperation between the People's Republic of China and Pakistan? What is the extent of this co-operation? What is the Government's reaction to this cooperation? How are you attempting to combat it diplomatically?

My next question Madam, relates to what the Prime Minister stated here as the Minister of External Affairs allowing upon his visit abroad, which relates to cooperatior between France and Pakistan.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jaswant Singh, please conclude.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH; I have just two more questions to ask.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): Very relevant questions.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your questions are almost like speeches. Everybody who speaks in the House is very relevant.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: It is very important. It is for the defence of the country.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: As far as France-Pak nuclear cooperation is concerned, it relates specifically to the Chashma Reactor.. The Prime Minister here in the House—it is a matter of record—said that it is a matter of concern to us but a nuclear reactor by France to Pakistan is with full-scope safeguards. These are not his exact words but this is what is implied. I think there is some confusion existing in the Ministry of External Affairs between full-scope safeguards and IAEA safeguards. Will the Minister explain the difference between full-scope safeguards and IAEA safe guards? The Prime Minister's understanding in the matter is faulty when he says that the French offer is with full-scope safeguards. If it is not faulty, would the Minister now clarify the situation?

Madam, I would just conclude with two questions. On$_e$ is relating to the recent talks at the Secretary level in which the Government, despite the existence of what it says i§ a nuclear threat from Pakistan, decided to talk on nuclear matters along with a No War pact and a Treaty of Peace and Friendship. Would the Minister, therefore, clarify? Did you talk only of joint mutual inspection of nuclear sites or did you also talk of a No War pact and a Treaty of Peace and Friendship. If the threat from Pakistan is what it is, then where is the relevance and where is the need of talking of peace and friendship when a threat like the nuclear threat i$_s$ with us?

Finally, Madam, as far as the USA is concerned, the USA has chosen to have Pakistan as a front-line State with strategic congruence on interests. They have waived the Symington amendment. Then, the President of the USA has—which to my *min&'is*[1] more telling—declined to confirm in writing as the Congress wanted him to do, that Pakistan is not following a nuclear programme. If the President of the United State- has declined to give such confirmation as the Congress of the U.S. wanted him to do, what is the Government of India's assessment of that inability of the President of the United States?

Madam, there are many more things to be said. But I would conclude by saying that ideally we wanted the Prime Minister to have been here. A number of questions that have arisen can only be answered by him because they relate directly to statements made by him. We would even now appeal to the Government to give up all ambiguity as a policy when it comes to nuclear questions, when it comes to nuclear threats facing the country, because ambiguity, as I. started by saying, spreads alarm at home and confusion abroad. Do something to remove both alarm at home and confusion abroad. Do what we in the BJP have done. We have come out categorically on the subject of threat facing the country.

Thank you, Madam.

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA (Haryana): Looking at the statement of the hon. Minister I was a bit amazed because only about 10 days before, i.e. on the 23rd of July, 1985, the hon. Prime Minister, while replying to certain clarification, regarding his visit abroad, made some statements in this House having a bearing on this very aspect and the present statement of the hon. Foreign Minister goes

[.Shri Sushil Chand Mohunta] absolutely at a tangent with what the hon. Prime Minister said. On that day, I asked a number of clarifications from the hon. Prime Minister and I would like to quote just two of them. I asked:

The first is that they (referring to the U.S.A.) are arming_Pakistan with sophisticated, weapons. Those weapons are disproportionate to the needs of Pakistan. The apprehension in the minds of our people is that those weapons are being amassed stockpiled and will be ultimately used against our country, thus disturbing the peace in our region and entailing a lot of destruction. The second point is that Pakistan i_s going ahead with the manufacture and production of the nuclear bomb. People say that they have already made the bomb, even tested it- I do not know. In any case, it is apparent that they are going fast ahead with the manufacture and production of the nuclear bomb. Once they acquire the nuclear bomb, it will be a constant source of danger to our region and to peace in this region."

These two questions were put and clarifications sought from the hon. Prime Minister who. while giving a reply, said:

"Yes, we did bring up the question of U.S.A. supplying weapons to Pakistan. ,But we made it very clear that it was only affecting us to the extent that we had to spend money in purchasing arms ourselves and we were not interfering in what was happening between the U.S.A. and Pakistan. We were not there to whine about what was happening in a neighbouring country. India is big enough, strong enough. W_e do not need to whine about what is happening elsewhere."

This reflects a mood of complacency. Then regarding the second aspect, the hon**.** Prime Minister replied:

"One Member mentioned about the U.S. arming Pakistan with nuclear weapons."

It was not a question of U.S. arming Pakistan with nuclear weapons. It was a question of Pakistan arming itself. He said:

"One Member mentioned about the US arming Pakistan with nuclear weapons. I am not aware of this. In case you hear,j about it, please let us know and we will check about it."

I may just remind the hon. Foreign Minister that in 1971, just before the hostilities started between $lndi_a$ and Pakistan at that time India was in a state of alert an_ci preparedness and Pakistan did not possess the sophisticated weapons as it possesses today. In spite of that we were not able to stop Pakistan from successfully bombing as remote areas as Agra and so many other places in India. They were able to throw bombs over there successfully. If Pakistan acquires nuclear capability or has atom bombs in its arsenal, does the Foreign Minister or the Government. h,ave the view that they will be able to stop Pakistan from crossing our frontiers by air through their sophisticated planes and check them from dropping these nuclear weapons in India? I can tell you that dropping of nuclear weapons will not be the same as dropping of those 1000 pounds bombs at Agra or other places. The dropping of even a single nuclear bomb, as we already know from our experience of what happened in Nagasaki and Hiroshima, will cause us such great hardship and trouble that I do no* think we will be left with the capability of striking badk. So, I must warn the Foreign Minister" that you wake up from this sleep and stupor and do not behave like y®u behaved in the olden times and said that $_W$e were a big enough country and we could stand aggression, and we found that India was attacked and hordes run through the length and breadth of

this country. Don't under-eotimate a person with whom you have gone to war a number of times earlier. I warned you on that day when" I was seeking clarifications from the Prime Minister. The capability with which Pakistan is today equipped, the arms with which it is equipped, is sufficient to raise at least a sense of alarm in us, and we should be prepared to meet it and not say that We are a big enough country and^we do not need any protection except that we have also *to* step up our armed preparedness. That is not sufficient. The question is that it must be stopped . For the information' of the hon. Foreign Minister. I may just say that when Cuba was being armed with missiles and other lethal weapons by some countries, and America found that Cuba, if armed with those devastating weapons would be a source of danger to the United States of America or to other parts of the American continent, they immediately put what is famously known as the quarantine of Cuba, and they were successful in seeing those sophisticated weapons removed from Cuba. The Monroe Doctrine has sufficiently been tried since 1823 when it was propounded by President Monroe in America. We are living in India. We do not want to interfere with the affairs of the other countries. But, at the same time, we are very anxious about our own security. And, therefore, I would like to ask a pointed question whether the hon. Minister thinks of a doctrine of the type of the Monroe Doctrine. I don't think we have this capability of going through the Monroe Doctrine and adopting it. But you can think of a device by which we can protect our interests. And if any neighbouring country tries to acquire military weapons which can pose a potential danger for the security of this country and which can be used successfully against our country, we should think of a device by which We will see that that stage ©f preparedness is not reached *In* those neighbouring countries. W« should diplomatically or in any other forum available to us fight against it. What is the use of sleeping over here, seeing the other country Being armed to the full teeth" and then ultimately saying that we will be able to defend ourselves? Why reach that stage at all? So> the question which arises is this. As has been coming out in the press arid ^s" my friend, Mr. Jaswant Singh, pointed out on an earlier occasion, it has been said a number of times by the Government of India that we are not going in for nuclear weapons. Yet, in a statement in Paris during his foreign visit, the Prime Minister said in a interview to a weekly, Naval Obser-vator, "that India will have to think about taking proper measures if a nuclear bomb appears on our frontiers." "Talking to newsmen today, Mr. Gandhi said India did not have the nuclear weapons ancT^fia'd, no plans to manufacture them. But if Pakistan developed nuclear weapons, India could be compelled to change its stand." I say, why should our stand be changed or modulated after the acquiring of that capability, of that dangerous device by a foreign country when we know that it is being armed nuclearly? They have acquired the trigger mechanism. *(Time bell rings),* They are already enriching uranium. And it is well-known by now that the enriched uranium is only used in a nuclear explosive device and has no other use. When we know all these things why should we try to fool ourselves and say we will wait till Pakistan acquires a bomb and tests ft successfully?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mohunta. please concludeTlow.

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA: Therefore, my questions, are: Number one, whether you are aware of the fact that Pakistan is today in a better armed position than It was in 1971. Secondly, itg delivery system of bombs or other nuclear de-

[Shri Sushil Chand Mohunta]

vice, into our country and its capa- ! bility of doing so, is today greater I than it was in 1971. If it could drop I bombs in the interior of our coun- ' try in 1971, is that capability still maintained by Pakistan or has "Seen lost? How are we in a position today to defend our frontiers and the interior of our country and save it from the nuclear bomb explosion? Can we protect ourselves or not? Are we in a position to dissuade other big powers like America or France or other countries- from helping Pakistan so that they may not help Pakistan in going nuclear? Are we in a position to pressurise directly or through other friendly countries, Pakistan so that Pakistan could be dissuaded from manufacturing nuclear bomb? As Pakistan is making nuclear bomb, are we going to change our stand categorically and tell our own people not to remain complacent and say that we do not want to use these nuclear bombs, but that we must have these nuclear bombs for our own protection? Are We going to make ft known or not, or are we still vacillating? These are the questions .

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र (बिहार) : उपसभापति महोदय, अभी जो ध्यानाकर्षण पर चर्चा चल रही है उससे ऐसा लगता है कि पाकिस्तान ने एटम-बम बना लिया है या वह बनाने के बहुत करीब है । यह काफी खतरनाक बात है हमारे लिए क्योंकि हम इसके निकटतम पड़ोसी हैं ऐसा लगता है यह अत्यन्त ही एक खतरनाक साजिश है। इस सवाल पर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री बराबर जो चिंता प्रकट करते रहे हैं या सरकार की ओर से जो कहा जाता रहा है, वह सही ही है और वह राष्ट्रीय चिंता का अंग है ।

उपसभापति जी, हमारा मतभेद है सरकार से और जैसा दूसरे माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा है कि वह पाकिस्तानी एटम बम नहीं है, वह दरहकीकत पाकिस्तानी नाम से अमरीकी बम है, अमरीकी न्यूक्लियर बम है । जो कुछ हो रहा है, वह अमरीका की मदद से हो रहा है वह चाहे छुपे रुस्तम हों या खुलकर हों । इस सवाल को उचित रूप में जब तक नहीं समझेंगे, तब तक हम इस चीज का मुकाबला नहीं कर सकेंगे । अमरीकन राष्ट्रपति से हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने बातचीत की । यह अच्छी बात है। प्रधान मंत्री ने इस ओर उनका ध्यान आकर्षित कराया, यह भी अच्छी बात है । लेकिन यह भूल नहीं जाना चाहिए, वह दोनों तरफ से हमको परेशान करना चाहते हैं । अगर भारत न्यूक्लियर बम बना ले, अणु-बम बना ले, तो इसकी प्रतिष्ठा को भारी आघात पहुंचेगा, जो हमारी शांति के लिए प्रतिष्ठा बनी हुई है, वह कमजोर हो जाएगी और अगर हम इसकी तैयारी करें बनाने की या मुकाबला करने के लिए तो उसके लिए हम काफी साधन खर्चा करें और हमारे गरीब देश के लिए वह कठिन हो जाएगा । लेकिन मोरेलिटी के नाम पर या खर्चा के नाम पर यह बम नहीं बनें, ऐसा हम नहीं चाहते । अगर हमारे देश के लिए ऐसी खतरनाक स्थिति हो जाएगी, तो यह दोनों चीजें बाधक नहीं होंगी । लेकिन अभी इस सवाल को इस रूप में नहीं समझें कि यह पाकिस्तानी बम नहीं है, बल्कि अमरीकन बम है, तो हमारे लिए गलती की गुंजाइश है । इसलिए इस दृष्टिकोण से हमको इसको देखना चाहिये ।

दूसरी बात हम यह कहना चाहेंगे कि आप कितना भी कहें कि प्रधान मंत्री अमरीका गये, यह बहुत सफल यात्रा रही, बहुत सफल एक बातचीत हुई, बातचीत तो सफल हुई हमारी, लेकिन दस मिलियन डालर मिला चाइना को, साढ़े तीन मिलियन डालर मिला पाकिस्तान को । इतनी बातचीत हमारी सफल रही । कुछ माननीय सदस्य कहते हैं, प्रश्न के रूप में कहते हैं कि डिप्लोमैटीकली हम फेल कर गये । डिप्लोमैसी की एक लिमिटेशन है । अमरीका जानबूझकर हमको डिस्टेब्लाइज करना चाहते हैं । आप स्वतन्त्र नीति का अवलम्बन कर रहे हैं, आप निर्गुट देशों का नेतृत्व कर रहे हैं साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ तो वह जानबूझकर के आपके खिलाफ ऐसा कर रहे हैं ।

इसमें डिप्लोमेसी का लिमिटेड रोल है जब तक कि आप दुश्मन को सही ढंग से समझ न लें । दूसरे, प्रश्न के रूप में सुजेशन आया है कि अगर पाकिस्तान अणु-बम बना रहा है तो हम लोग उस पर एडवांस हमला कर दें जैसे कि इजराइल ने किया था । मैं समझता हूं कि यह अत्यन्त ही घातक होगा और यह विश्व युद्ध की शुरुआत कर देगा । मेरा ऐसा ख्याल है कि सेकण्ड वर्ल्ड वार के बाद एक नया कोरिलेशन आफ फोसज पूरी दुनियां में हुआ है और वह को-रिलेशन आफ फोर्सेज ऐसा बना है कि जिसमें साम्राज्यवादी देश अगर दूसरे देश पर हमला करना चाहेंगे तो वह पहले जैसा संभव नहीं है । अब कोई कैरेबियन आईलैण्ड में, या किसी छोटे-मोटे आइलैण्ड पर हमला कर सकता है हमको और आपको याद है कि मिश्र पर जो इंग्लैण्ड ने और फ्रांस ने हमला किया था तो मिश्र इतना ताकतवर नहीं था कि वह उनका मुकाबला कर सके लेकिन वह युद्ध रोक दिया गया और उसे आगे नहीं बढ़ने दिया गया । यह एक नयी शक्ति का सन्तुलन है जिसको हमको समझना चाहिये । यही नयी शक्ति सन्तुलन है जिसमें खुमैनी का ईरान जो न्यूक्लियर नहीं था लेकिन अमरीका के पास सब कुछ साधन थे, न्यूक्लियर साधन भी थे, लेकिन वह उस पर हमला नहीं कर सका । हालांकि अमरीका बहुत अपमानित हुआ सारी दुनियां में । हम लोग इस बात को जानते है और अमरीका के लोगों ने और उसके भूतपूर्व राष्ट्रपति ने अब स्पष्ट कर दिया कि वह भारत पर भी अणुबम का इस्तेमाल की बात सोच रहे थे । 1971 में और चीन पर अणुबम चलाने की भी सोच रहे थे । तो कोई ऐसी शक्ति है जो उन लोगों को रोक रही है । वह शक्ति है शांति की ताकतों की । मैं समझता हूं कि हमारी सरकार इस दिशा में जो प्रयास कर रही है, जो हमारे देश के अन्दर दिल्ली डिक्लेरेशन हुआ, जो निर्गुट राष्ट्रों का डिक्लेरेशन हुआ और अभी जो 6 राष्ट्रों की ओर से शांति डिक्लेरेशन हुआ है उसका असर हुआ है और यह भारत है जो पिछले कई दशाब्दियों से शान्ति के लिए प्रयास कर रहा है । इसको हमको जोरदार बनाना चाहिए। यह सबसे बड़ी शक्ति है जो डिटरेंट होगी, जो इसको रोक सकेगी । जब पीपुल्स मोबोलाइजेशन वर्ल्ड वाइड होगा, जिसमें अमरीकन जनता भी साथ देगी तो अणुयुद्ध को हम रोकने के लिए काम कर सकेंगे । अणु बम बनाना इतना इम्पोर्टेंट नहीं है । दूसरे मैं समझता हूं कि जो प्रयास पाकिस्तान के साथ सम्बन्ध अच्छा करने के लिए हो रहे हैं वह भी किये जाने चाहिये । साथ साथ मैं चाहूंगा कि पाकिस्तान की जनता और भारत की जनता की दोस्ती का जो अभियान हो रहा है उसको और भी जोरदार बनाना चाहिये क्योंकि हमको यह नहीं भूलना चाहिये कि वहां के शासक तानाशाह हैं। वहां की जनता उनके साथ नहीं है और इसलिए एक ऐसा नया सम्बन्ध हमको उनके साथ बनाना चाहिये ।

इस प्रसंग में मैं एक बात की चर्चा और आप से करना चाहूंगा कि अगर भारत पर या पाकिस्तान पर कोई आणविक हमला होता है तो यह कोई आइसोलेटेड नहीं रहेगा । यह तुरन्त विश्व युद्ध का रूप धारण कर लेगा । यह कोई कंवेंशनल वार नहीं है जो लिमिटेड रहेगी और इसलिये जब अमरीका से ही मुकाबला करना होगा तो बहुत बड़ी समस्या उठ जाएगी । आप जानते हैं कि इजराइल को भी अणु बम मिल गया है। साउथ अफ्रीका को भी अणु बम मिल गया है। इसी तरह से एक नये पाकिस्तानी डिक्टेटर को, जिसने फ्रंट लाइन स्टेट का रूप ले लिया है, अणु बम मिल गया है । यहां स्थिति है जिस का हम को मुकाबला करना है। इस लिये मैं समझता हूं कि बहुत ज्यादा एलार्मिंग दृष्टिकोण नहीं लेना चाहिए। ऐसी शक्ति है जो इस को रोकती है, जिस ने अमरीका को रोका है 1971 में, उन को भारत पर आणविक बम गिराने से रोका है, उस ने ही उस को चीन पर आणविक बम गिराने से रोका है। वह शक्ति अभी भी बरकरार है । उस शक्ति को हम को और जोरदार बनाना चाहिए ।

और आखिरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि इस का यह कतई मतलब नहीं है कि हम को कैपेबिलिटीज नहीं क्रियेट करनी

[श्री चतुरानन मिश्र]

चाहिए । इस स्टेटमेंट में कहा गया है और मैं इस को और जोरदार देखना चाहता था कि हम कांस्टेंट विजिल में है।

"...a constant vigil on all developments having a bearing on the country's security."

तो सरकार तो बराबर कांस्टेंट विजिल में रहती ही है । सरकार कभी सोती भी नहीं है रात हो या दिन हो, लेकिन जिस ढंग से हम लोग तबाह हो रहे हैं इस सरकारी विजिल के अंदर और जो कई बार हुआ है तो इस विजिल से तो नान-विजिल हो अच्छी है । इसलिए हम कहेंगे कि खाली विजिलैंस मत कहिएगा ।

1.00 P.M.

आप कहिएगा की हम तो कैपेसिटी तैयार रखेंगे । अभी तुरन्त बम बनाने की स्थिति नहीं होगी और अगर होगी तो हम उस पर बाद में विचार करेंगे । इसके लिए हम तैयार रहेंगे । लेकिन डिप्लोमैसी में आप कहें और डिप्लोमेटिक शब्द अगर आप इस्तेमाल करते हैं तो हमको ऐतराज नहीं है, लेकिन डिप्लोमैसी अपनी अंडरस्टैंडिंग के लिए नहीं रहनी चाहिए क्योंकि हालत संगीन होती जा रही है । यही हमारा प्रश्न होगा कि यह कैपेबिलिटी हमको तैयार रखनी है ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House i* adjourned for lunch till 2.00 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at on© minute Past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at four minutes past two of the clock. The Vice/Chairman (Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal) in the Chair.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): Mr- Vice-Chairman, Sir. looking .at the" Treasury "Benches it looks as if they are not very much concerned about the bomb; that is why they are empty.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Read today's *Indian Express.*

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Sir, there are three options before India so far as nuclear weapon is concerned. One is to do nothing and leave it to our fate. Second is to go in for ,a bomb. Third is not to make a bomb at all and to take some sort of help from the nuclear powers— in other words to have a nuclear umbrella. These are broadly the options before us. Here -I would like to avoid, for the sake of discussion, moral and ethical considerations. We in this House are concerned with our national security. The national interests have got to be protected at all costs and~the defence.? have got to b© adequate, strong and equal to meet the challenges from our neighbours or beyond our neighbours. We have learnt the lesson from history. Whenever India was weak in weapons, though strong in manpower, we have been defeated. Therefore it is of utmost importance to build up our defences and our defences should not be ever a bit inferior to the preparations which are made by our neighbours, by our rivals.

After having said this, what is the predicament in which we are placed now? Let us analyse this. Pakistan is preparing itself for manufacturing nuclear weapons. Maybe they are having nuclear weapons. The technology is so developed today in the world that it is not necessary to explode a bomb, but still we can have a bomb. When atom bomb was exploded on, Hiroshima, America never exploded it before for testing it. It was exploded and it killed more than 2 lakhs of people in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. So it is not necessary to explode a bomb to make a bomb. Let us be very clear on that.

Secondly, I also concede the pre dicament of my friend. the hon Minister, here. He cannot make J categorical statement. He canno say yes or no to the question whethe we should go in for a bomb of not

Because no country in the world till now has given notice that it would be making a bomb. Let Us realise this. Neither America nor Russia nor England nor France nor China has given notice to its Assembly or to the world that it is going in for a bomb. Therefore, I do not expect my friend here to tell me "that he is going in for a bomb. But at the same time we have our political duties, responsibilities, to let him know the feeling of this "House, the opinion of this House, this august body, on this important issue.

At the same time, I say that we are making efforts' y> reach an understanding with Pakistan on various issues. Even three days back "there was a meeting of the Pakistani representative and our representative here. I would like this process of normalisation of the relationship between India and Pakistan should go on. If it can be brought about it will be mutually beneficial. This issue should not mar the relationship or the atmosphere at all. Therefore, I am a bit careful when I am making these ramarks in the House. I not want the process of normalisation between India and Pakistan, the process of creating a climate of .friendship between these two countries should be marred. And we should help that process. If we can, "we should try to convince the Pakistani Government that India is not its enemy at all and that the nuclear Policy of Pakistan directed against India is meaningless. Perhaps, I am hoping against hopes. But I am not being defensive at all in my statement, Sir. But, in this matter a certain amount of flexibility, manoeuve-rability, is always to be kept before us when we are dealing with foreign Governments.

If Pakistan goes in for a bomb, what should we do? My difficulty is why we should equate our country with Pakistan, China has gone forward and has atomic arsenal In its possession. China is not a friendly country from my point of view though we are seeking to have adjustments with China, to have good I relations with China, though we are I establishing our contacts with China, it is not a friendly neighbour. History has made China and India neighbours. That is a geographical reality. We have to live with that.. But China is not a very friendly country. I* may not be hostile, but it is not friendly either. When it made the bomb, why did we shirk our responsibility? i just put this question across. I put this across because there is a dangerous tendency of equating India and Pakistan, which I resisit in my thought. I do not want to claim the status of a big brother. I think we have got a status a better status than that of Pakistan in every sense of the term. Why should" we equate ourselves with Pakistan? That is worrying me. Whenever there i'3 some preparations in Pakistani, should we "Be panicky? No. We should prepare ourselves whether Pakistan prepares itself or not, whether China prepares itself or not. Our defence is uppermost, paramount, while taking into consideration not only Pakistan, but China and also other countries. Therefore, I would like a foreign policy a defence policy, having large parameters, not just having a narrow perspective. When we are talking about atomic bomb, nuclear weapons, let us also say this to ourselves: Are we lagging behind Pakistan? I want to be told on that. Are we lagging behind Pakistan in nuclear capabilities? I don't think- we are lagging behind Pakistan. My friend was quoting about enriched uranium technology. I know a bit of "'atomic area as I handled this for some time as * Minister. I know the capability of our scientists. If Pakistan can have a bomb, we can have a bomb also today. That is my information. Let" anybody repudiate it. Why do you think that we cannot have a bomb? We can have a bomb now. We have the capacity, the wherewithal. 8 think there should be a certain amount'

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

of ambiguity in our diplomacy to an extent. I say that I don't expect the Treasury Benches to answer me, "yes or no" on this issue. But we should always be prepared, for any eventuality. The question is not to make a bomb or not to make a bomb. The Question is if eventualities arise, whether we can afford not 'to make a bomb. Such eventualities arise and this great country should be prepared to make a bomb, notwithstanding the moral and ethical considerations. Here I am painful to notice the statements of the previous Prime Minister and the present Prime Minister. Mrs. Gandhi said in Helsinki and later on in Athens last year, "Come what may. we do not want to make a bomb." She had taken that position. I think it is not a logical and tenable position to take as a country. Again the Present Prime Minister has said, has gone on record, that he does noifbe-lieve in deterrent theory or balance of terror. Whether he is really convinced of that, I do not know. Then the Americans and the Russians are fools. They are making bomb^after bomb. There is a big debate in European countries about the deployment of Pershing missiles. Are'"they fools? Why do we come to' any judgement at all? It is a dangerous-ly fluid situation in the world. No country in the world is sure of itself. In European countries, perhaps some of our friends may be aware, the youth in West Germany. France, Italy, have started a new movement. What are the three things that they are having uppermost in'their mind? (1) Ecology, environment; (2) Employment; and (3)—the most important—peace. They are afraid of war. The youth in those counfries are gloomy*, despondent Why? Though they have material prosperity. Their standard of living is very high. They are gloomy and the future is dark, they say. That is why they have started a new party in West Germany, the GREENS, which is spreading. They say: "No war at any cost." The world has got to be made safer for democracy, for peace, they say. In spite of that in spite of this reaction, trie Governments of those countries have different calculations and they are going ahead with their preparations, with their arsenals and they have not stopped. Please remember, Sir, that after a few years, the nuclear technology is no longer going to be the monopoly of a few countries in the world. Even now it is not the monopoly of a few countries. We can manufacture bombs; Israel can manufacture the bomb; and Japan can go in for the bomb. But they do not want to go in for the nuclear bomb for their own reasons. Japan, for instance, does not want to manufacture these bombs because it thinks that it is under the US umbrella— there is a peace treaty. But we do not want to go under the~~umbrg?la of anybody. Let us *V& ver^* clear about this and let us also be' clear that we should not take an absolute stand that we do not manufacture the bomb at any cost. I say that it is suicidal to take, that position, in a rapidly changing situation, in a dangerously fluid situation in the world of ours. If the compulsions do require, we may have to make the bomb and there is no alternative. But I am very clear in my mind that we do not want to seek anybody's umbrella so far as our securiy is concerned. *(Time Bell rings)*

Secondly, Sir, we do not want, as I said earlier and I repeat, to take a "No-bomb" approach at any cost. So, our option has got to be open for going in for the bomb. The most important driving and compulsive element in this is whether we can safeguard our security, whether we can defend ourselves as a nation, and whether we can meet any. challenges, any threats, any intimidations from abroad or, maybe, from our. neighbours or from somewhere else and if the bomb is necessary for thai purpose, we have got to go in for

that. I may look very equivocal in my. statement. But I am very clear in my mind that the compulsions and the imperatives of the situation, the defence requirements of the country, alone will direct and should direct our thinking on the atom bomb and no other thing should prevail on us. on our minds. The question of resources should not come in the way. Sir, on this point, let me say, China has diverted its resources to the making of the bomb and, at the same time, has been able to develop economically, and that has not prevented America from helping, or assisting China. Let there not be any fear that because we may have to divert our resources for manufacturing the nuclear weapons, there might be hostility of Russia, of America or opposition elsewhere. No, I think our country is big enough to take all the shocks. But I only say that if compulsions warrant, if imperatives do warrant, we may be prepared and our country should be ever prepared for any eventuality even to make a bomb. I again say that I do not expect a categorical answer from the Minister, because a certain amount of equivocation, ambivalence or ambiguity may be necessary in this regard. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Yes, Mr. Gopalsamy.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the threat from Pakistan nuclear programme is causing serious concern to India. The story of Islamic bomb starts with the late Zulfiqar Aii Bhutto who proclaimed waging 1000 year war with India. During his regime, in 1974, after India had a nuclear implosion, Libya had helped Pakistan \o stockpile 200 tonnes natural uranium through Niger by augmenting its own meagre resources of the material. Later, West Germany assisted Islamabad to set up a hexafloride plant at Multan. Then they started the espionage programme. A" scientist, Mr. A. Q. Khan, had worked in 1970s in a Dutch firm. Now he has become a hero in Pakistan. That began in 1975, the espionage, and the fruits were visible in 1983 when Pakistan stated to the world that it had mastered the difficult uranium enrichment process, whereas the Dutch authorities found that some 6500 centrifug tubes had been illegally taken out of the country in 1975-76. I would like to substantiate a theory which is appearing for the last few months in all magazines of the world that Pakistan has become a nuclear weapon power. I will quote what appeared in the western magazines.

> "As far as the design of the weapon is concerned, the information on this has emanated from Beijing. According to American intelligence sources quoted in New York Times, this is the same as the device used for China's fourth nuclear bomb test, in 1966. which had U-235 as the fissible material."

> "In June 1981 the *New Scientist* published from London claimed that Pakistan and China had signed an agreement bly which a nuclear device from the former could be tested on the territory of the latter. The *Financial Times,* London, for its part, said that Chinese scientists were working at Kahuta, 32, km from Islamabad—which will probably be the birthplace of the 'Islamic' bomb."

Sir, I would like to quote a Press report which was given by the Director of the Institute of Defence Studies and Analysis, Mr. K. Subramanyam. It will be very relevant. I think it is my duty to draw the attention of the Government to what he has said.

> "Q. What implication does this (the krypton switch tests) have for India?
>
> A. This is simple and clear. Pakistan is on its way to making nuclear weapons.

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

Q. Could Pakistan drop a nuclear weapon on India without carrying out a test first?

A. Yes. that is very possible. The krypton switch triggered explosions definitely pose a threat to India. It is an issue that must be taken up immediately and urgently.

Q. Can we call Pakistan a nuclear power?

A. There is a great possibility that it might already have a nuclear weapon, whether or not it is a nuclear power. The stamp of nuclear power is not the criterion for a country having nuclear weapons."

So, from these reports we have got the impression that Pakistan has got the nuclear weapon power status. (Time BeU *rings,)* Sir, Mr. Jaswant Singh was correctly saying that there are Mutually Assured Deterrence a? far as the western powers and the Soviet Union are concerned because there is Mutually-Assured Destruction. We have entered the era of a mad world. The Mutually Assured Deterrents are there. Of course, apart from the 5 countries, i.e. U.S.A., U.S.S.R.. France. U.K. and China, Israel has also become a clandestine nuclear power and South Africa has also become a clandestine incipient power. The first four countries are having 936 infra-structures throughout the world beyond their territories. The threat from Diego Garcia is there. They are having the infra-structure. Our hon. Prime Minister has sent a message right earnestly that we must Put a fullstop to all nuclear arsenals and that the moratorium announced by the U.S.S.R. should be a permanent moratorium and the United States should respond to that. But all the nuclear powers have stockpiled nuclear weapons more than necessary to wipe out the entire mankind from the earth. Here the case with Pakistan is totally different. The U.S.S.R., the U.S.A. and other countries have stopped stockpiling weapons. They are afraid of mutual destruction. What has been our experience in the past? In 1962, great Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the jewel of India, the architect of non-alignment movement, who strived for peaceful coexistence and Panchsheel, who was for peace and prosperity and freedom for the entire mankind, was betrayed, miserably betrayed, by our neighbour, China. That is why we had to face the Himalayan blunder in 1962. We have faced three wars with Pakistan. Every time they have been chased. Every time when they poked their nose, they had a bloody nose. A dictator who is handling the affairs of a country and who is always facing public revolt, may try at any time to play a dangerous game in order to divert the attention of the people of his country. So, we have to be very very careful and cautious in our approach. I do not want the Minister to say 'yes' or 'no' while answering questions. I know that this is not a matter of eliciting definite answers from the Minister. I am not for that. But a grave threat is there. If a mad man or a maniac has in his hand a dangerous bomb that could be thrown any time. According to the report, Pakistan is possessing the nuclear bomb. That is why we are very much alarmed. The hon. Prime Minister said very categorically in New York: What for they are having the enriched uranium? Where are they sending it? What is the need for krypton switch? What is the need for that? Is it for peaceful purposes? Definitely no. These are matters which are tormenting our minds. Let Pakistan be under the illusion that they are ahead of us. Reports which appeared yesterday clearly indicate that the pride of India is its man missilepower. We have got the potential. We have got the technology, we have got the morale with which we could face any eventuality. Even then, it is my foremost duty as a citizen, as a Member to draw the attention of the Government

to the alarming reports that Pakistan has become a nuclear weapon power and we should be prepared for any eventuality.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the circumstances and the news that appeared in the press go to show that Pakistan is on the way to make a nuclear bomb. In fact, the statements of the scientists of Pakistan indicate that Pakistan is already in possession of a nuclear bomb. If that is so, it is a great concern to the people of India and to all the peace-loving people of the world.

Sir, Pakistan has been acquiring sophisticated weapons from the USA and from other countries—we do not know what those other countries are. But it is a fact that Pakistan is already equipped with all the weapons that are not required for its defence. The United States of America is under the impression that these weapons may be useful to Pakistan either for its defence against Afghanistan or the Soviet Union. What we feel is that the USA is under the wrong impression. It was our past experience that Pakistan made four attempts on India and on all these occasions, these weapons were used against our country. And it is well-known that these weapons are not going to be used either against the Soviet Union or Afghanistan or China or any other country. I do not know whether our Prime Minister and the External Affairs Minister during their recent visit to the United States of America impressed upon the President of the USA about these dangers. From what the press reports say and from the answers given to my questions in this House, there is an indication that they have discussed with the President of the USA. I do not know the details and I do not know what the reaction was of the President of America. I would like to know from the Minister—I think he was also there—as to what exactly was the reaction of the President of America, Mr. Reagan, when you drew his attention to the dangers of supplying these weapons to Pakistan. If these weapons are continued to be supplied to Pakistan, the whole region will he endangered, the balance of peace will be in danger and not only the peace in this region but also of the world will be destroyed. This fact should have been brought to the notice of the USA

Secondly, Sir, we want peace. We do not want war with Pakistan or any other country. As a matter of fact, Pakistan has offered a no-war pact, and we have offered a peace and friendship treaty. I do not know what progress has been made in this direction. These negotiations are going on and at the same time Pakistan is preparing itself for a war by getting the sophisticated weapons, the latest being the F-16 and also the nuclear bomb. I do not know whether you have discussed these matters with Pakistan during these discussions. If really both the countries want peace and friendship, want a no-war pact, are these weapons necessary, is the preparation on the part of Pakistan necessary? So, what is the reaction of Pakistan in this regard so far as the manufacture of these weapons is concerned? Thirdly, I would like to know from the Minister whether it is not a fact that Pakistan has gone in for atomic or nuclear bomb and we are committed to use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. We are committed to that. Even during the visit of the Prime Minister to foreign countries, he stated that 'India possesses no nuclear bomb and India has no intention to manufacture any such weapons.' When Pakistan is already On way to manufacture a nuclear bomb, whether we should simply depend upon the assurances of the United States of America or other countries or we are also preparing ourselves to meet this nuclear danger from Pakistan. I would like to know it from the hon. Minister. To my question in this House, th'e Prime Minister was kind enough to say— the question was: Are you going to meet nuclear threat from Pakistan? The answer was "Yes'. But in what

[Shri B. satyanarayan Reddy] way are you going. It means that we are also prepared to go in for nuclear bomb. So I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether we are preparing ourselves to meet the situation! if any such danger occurs to our country from Pakistan.

Fourthly, I would like to read from the interview our Prime Minister gave in France. Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi has said that Pakistan has or soon shall have a nuclear weapon, and that is the major preoccupation of Indian Government. We think they are very near to having it or they already have one, in fact, more than one, Mr. Gandhi told the newspaper *Le Monde* in an interview published today; "As far as we are concerned, we have not made any decision to develop such weapon but we are thinking about it" he said. "Understand that for India: the possession of a nuclear weapon by Pakistan is very worrying. Islamabad already has attacked us three times. That they have the bomb, would change all the rules of the game. We must think about it very seriously."

I would like to know from the Minister as to what is really meant by this. We must be very clear whether we are going in for a nuclear bomb or not. Pakistan has already got one; that is a fact but these confusing statements appear in the press and also in this House; no clear-cut policy has been adopted by the Government of India. I would like to know from the Minister as to what we are really doing to meet this danger from Pakistan. There are differences of opinion in this country. . Some are of the opinion that we . should not go in for a nuclear bomb. There were seminars where opinions had been expressed that we must keep our options open and there were opinions that under no circumstances should we go in for nuclear bomb. But there are others who say that in .the interest of safety, of this country and to keep the whole region in peace* we must go in for nuclear bomb. All these questions are there. I would like to know whether we are going to consider these questions seriously and to what conclusions has the Government of India come, whether you have definitely decided not going in for nuclear weapons or you are keeping the options open or you are going to....

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra) ; He has said that we are keeping the options open.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: I am not expecting an answer from my friend; you keep your ideas with you and express them. Let the Minister answer. It is not a simple question. It is a very serious question. It is a question of security and peace in this region and in the world. We do not want to see any Nagasaki or Hiroshima of 6th August, 1945. If nuclear weapons are developed, if you go into competitions, this danger is there and I want to know whether you have impressed upon the Government of Pakistani to see to these dangers. Not only the Government of Pakistan, but France, the United States of America and other countries which the Prime Minister has visited. A recent news report says... *(Time bell rings)* Recently, the French Ambassador *to* Islamabad has said...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Please do not read the whole of it.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: This is a very serious thing.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Just refer to it. If you read it, it will take a long time.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY; The French Ambassador to • Islamabad has said that France is | ready to offer nuclear reactor to Pakistan. He has also said that French" policy in this respect will not be governed by pressures from India, or, for that matter, from any other country. This is the news which has ap-

peared in the Press. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether this issue has been discussed...

श्री खुर्शीद आलम खान : किस अखबार में पढ़ लिया आपने ?

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: If you want, I will give it to you. You should go through all these things. You should not treat this as a simple debate for the sake of debate. We are seriously considering, seriously discussing this issue.

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN (Tamil Nadu): Yes.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY; We are here to bring to the notice of the House the dangers ahead for this country. Already, this country has faced four attacks, five attacks, in fact, four attacks from Pakistan and one from China. You should know that. You should know, when Mr. Krishna Menon was the Defence Minister, he took everything lightly and we know what the consequences were. As a matter of fact, we have lost thousands of square miles of our territory. You should not take things easily. Whatever we say, you should seriously consider them, you should think over them and then you should come to certain conclusions, so that the country will be saved from these dangers. We are not here to cut jokes or pass easy comments. We express our feelings in this House. It is our duty to convince this House, the nation, the people of this country, that we are taking it up seriously. A routine answer from the hon. Minister is not sufficient.

Sir, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the former U.S. President, Mr. Nixon, thought of using nuclear weapon against this country when Pakistan was in war with India. What is the reaction, what is the conclusion of the Government of India? How can we assume that the present President or future Presidents of the United States of America will not think in these terms? Have you thought over this? Did you bring this to the notice of the USA? The important question is whether these nuclear weapons are safe in the hands of the President of the United States or any other President of any country in the world, which may possess these weapons. This is my question. We should bring t_0 the notice of the people of the world the dangers posed by these nuclear weapons. I have already pointed out the statement made by the French Ambassador to Islamabad. I would like to know, what is the reaction of the President of France? Did the Prime Minister discuss with him the supply of nuclear materials to Pakistan? Thirdly, I would like t_0 know whether the Government of India possesses the capability to manufacture atom bomb, if need be.

श्री शान्ति त्यागी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : अब हो गया, बस करिये ।

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी : आप जरा सब्र करिये ।

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He has not triggered the switch.

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN: You are going slow like India's nuclear programme.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: That is the danger.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: He is very cautious.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Sir. we have appealed to different countries not to encourage Pakistan in getting these sophisticated weapons or in manufacturing atom bomb. Therefore, I would like to know whether all these issues were discussed with the world leaders when the Prime Minister visited these countries and what was the reaction of the leaders of these countries;

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN; Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, my hon. friend Mr. Gurupadaswamy'^ concern about the lack of presence of members from

[Shri R. Ramakrishnan]

the Treasury Benches has been misplaced, particularly because I find that the hon- Leader of the House, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs, the roaster duty Minister, the Minister answering the Call Attention and a good number of others are present either by intent or by accident in this House. I am also thankful that the discussion on this Call Attention has been admitted today, on the 7th August, and not yesterday, the 6th August, because that was the day that the world shuddered and paid tribute to those who were killed in Hiroshima.

Whether Pakistan's recent behaviour and pronouncements were that of a matured nation in the international political arena or that of a playful child who wants to show off its newly acquired toy is not clear, but whatever it may be, India cannot be a passive spectator to Pakistan's nuclear blackmail. Sir, most of the speakers here have mentioned about the necessity to make bomb. I may recall that in this very same House in November, 1980, I made a forceful plea during the Appropriation Bill that India should make the nuclear bomb. Five years have elapsed since then and what has perhaps caused the renewed concern about this major issue on the international front is the successful testing of the U.S. made Krypton electronic triggers by Pakistan recently. What is causing more concern is also the involvement of super powers, the United States, China and also France, whether directly or indirectly in Pakistan's nuclear programme. Even Senator Allen Crauston, who is the crusador for non-proliferation and the U.S. Nuclear Control Institute have stated that Pakistan is using all methods at its command, legal and .illegal, to augment its nuclear programme. That has been further aggravated by the pronouncements of the self-styled expert of the Pakistan nuclear programme—I do not know what his experience in this field is— Dr. Khan, who has very boastfully said recently that Pakistan has joined the exclusive club of seven as far as nuclear power is concerned. Then, it is a fact that in Houston Airport recently and also in New York and Montreal certain Pakistan nationals were found carrying electronic devices like the Krypton devices. They were arrested, and perhaps because of the Pakistani pressure they have * only been deported to Pakistan. This shows the intentions of Pakistan to go full-speed with this nuclear programme. I need not recall that NetherJand's court recently punished Pakistan's scientists in absentia for stealing secret nuclear information.

All this plus the intelligence information which is available to our defence experts and also the information which comes in the international media really causes concern.

Apart from this we find that no less a person than Dr. Hans Blix, who is head of the international atomic energy agencies has said that as much as 20 kilograms of plutonium was diverted from KANUPP reactor, that is the Karachi reactor plant by Pakistan. It is also gathered that Pakistan, apart from this recent experiment, will *go* ahead with the full-scale nuclear reconnaissance somewhere in the Chinese desert in September. 1986. All this will only add, as our Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi has said, to geo-political tension not only in this part of the globe but even perhaps may lead to further global tension.

Sir, my concern is not so much as Pakistan wanting to use this as a sort of threat to blackmail India. I feel that with the sagging morale in the Arab world, Pakistan wants to use this perhaps as a sort of morale boos-ter for itself to acquire the leadership of the Arab world or the Islamic world and the bomb therefore has been called the Islamic bomb. Added to this, we know that recently the Libyan adventurer has also entered

into a treaty with Pakistan for about 300 million dollars aid to its nuclear effort and he says that Libya will buy the first nuclear bomb made by Pakistan.

Sir, Emerson said that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. We have got to be very vigilant and the Minister's statement that Government have been keeping a constant vigil on all developments having a bearing on the country's security is very clear. But what I would like to tell the Minister is, let us not have any inhibitions. Some people say that Pakistan talks more and does less. Empty vessels make the most noise. But perhaps there is a feeling here—and I do not subscribe to that—that after the Pokharan test India has got the nuclear capability. Only thing is we are not announcing it. I would like to recall that this Parliament in 1962 passed an Act catted the Atomic Energy Act whose object was, amidst other things, to give power to the Government to develop, control and use atomic energy for the welfare of the people of India and for other peaceful purposes. Perhaps arising out of this Act, which is still on the Statute Book, the Minister says that India remains committed to developing nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. If India is going ahead with the nuclear programme. 1 do not think it should be a secret. We in Parliament, in the interest of national security, do not want to know all the details* of how much is being spent who is being trained or who are being engaged or what materials are being purchased or whose help is being sought. We do not want any of these details. All we want is a safe and secure India. And for this, I think it is high time that the Government should come forward and give up this nuclear celibacy and say, "yes, we are going to be nu-cleai' whether for peaceful, and iff necessary, for other purposes to defend! ourselves", Let there be no sort «f hush-hush about it; let there be openess about it.- You go ahead with whatever you want, do whatever you want, spent howsoever much you want. People will be next to none in supporting you. Every citizen in this country is patriotic enough to sacrifice in terms of having to give anything from other sectors of the economy. We are prepared for all this, provided you take us into confidence and say, "yes, we are going to counter any eventuality or threat.". Just make it very clear because most of the nations—the U.S.A., France and other nations of the world—have talked about non-iproliferation and they only pontificate and lecture while they themselves are adding to their arsenal much more. Though India is the Chairperson of the Non-Aligned Movement, that does not mean that we are in any way losser of second-rate country. We should show to the world, holding our head high that we are also a power, we are also now a developed country, and we will hold our head high in the international comity of nations. I want this categorical assurance from the Minister and from the Government of India, that we are prepared for any eventuality; make no secret about it. Thank you.

SHRI S. W. DHABE (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, my colleague, Mr-. Ramakri^hnan has air-ready stated that Pakistan has successfully tested the Krypton electrical triggering device. Not only that the press reports say that after testing this triggering device, Pakistan is! exploring the possibility of making a full scale nuclear bomb in the near fulture. The triggering mechanism is the main ingredient for making a nuclear device from Uranium 235 which is produced by enrichment of natural uranium. The design has been so developed that it is based on the uranium 235 and Pakistan had imported between 1978 and 1979 special steel for making it. It is now well known that 5 kilograms of

[Shri S W. Dhabe] U235 is enough for a bomb. Therefore, having acquired a capability to make a bomb, the inten-3 P.M. tions of Pakistan are very clear. It is not necessary for us to go into the intentions of Pakistan. It may be doing it for its own security purposes and for its own ambition to have leadership of other countries. The history of relations that we have got between Pakistan and India of the last ten years or more shows that they are not cordial. A part of our country is in its occupation. There were wars between Pakistan and India. And in that background our foreign policy should be based.

What Pakistan does or does not do certainly affecte us. It is going to affect us if it becomes a nuclear power.

[The Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

This threat it ;not only to our country but also to many countries hi the world. There is a need to have a big peace offensive. Unless the public opinion in Pakistan is charged in this matter, as they feel it is a matter of pride for them, we will be left without any alternative. The Calling Attention was about the steps taken toy th_e Government in this matter. Th_e whole statement of the Minister is silent, and a general statement lias been made that we axe keeping a constant vigil on all the developments. I would like to say that it is high time that India acted in this matter.

I would like to know from the Minister whether any peace offensive is being taken up by India to create a public opinion not only in Pakistan but also in other countries, which .should act as a deterrent, so that Pakistan does not move ahead with the nuclear programme. Secondly, if •it is a threat to our country, it i« .necessary that the public opinion must be mobilised. People must b« ready for meeting any threat or any eventuality that occurs in this country by explosion of a bomb or by any aggressive intenitiona or any act by Pakistan. Therefore, it will not help the Government if it keeps it a close secret. Pakistan has tried to keep it secret. But people all over the world know that Pakistan i_3 making the bomb. Our Government is not giving any information. It can lead to two conclusions. One is that we are not interested to have a nuclear weapon dr nuclear bomb and that we are only going to use it for peaceful purposes. Even then, about what steps, we are taking, the country must be taken into confidence. It will also boost up the morale or the country knowing that we ar_e a tir»t class power so far as the nuclear capability is concerned. Therefore, my second question is whether amy steps are being taken by the Government to counteract the threat from Pakistan because of this capability and possession of the nuclear weapons.

Therefore, my two questions are: Firstly, what peace offensive we are taking inside India and abroad to deter Pakistan from going ahead with the programme; and secondly, what i? our preparedness.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, yesterday was the 6th of August, and we discussed the tragedy of Hiroshima and stood in silence to pay homage to the victims of the atom bomb in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. And it is a travesty of fact that today, the very next day we are discuslsing here whether India should have a nuclear weapon in view of the threat posed by Pakistan.

Madam, in fact, threat is not from Pakistan only. The threat came to India from the U.S. imperialism. I think, as far back as 1971 they tried to blackmail India through the nuclear arsenal. This nuclear blackmailing is going on, and now the world is living, with 50,000 nuclear warheads. There is an-estimate mad* by some experts that we have come I to a situation where only 5 per cent

of our world scientists are engaged in the research work on pure science. The overall majority of the world scientists are engaged in the research work on the destructive part of the modern technology. The question is: whether India will run in that race. Our neighbouring country, Pakistan is also going to have a bomb very soon, but that is a different question. We know very well that taking into account the scientific and technological development of Pakistan and its economic and social development, on its own it cannot have a nuclear device. In fact with massive U.S. military assistance to the tune of $6 billion, Pakistan is now going in for a nuclear bomo.

Even a few days ago there were reports that the United States Government has supplied to Pakistan Krypton triggers for riggering off this nuclear weapon. Pakistan can make a bomb by becoming absolute stooges of U.S. imperialism. It cannot have a bomb on its own.

In 1*82 when the Atomic Energy Act was passed in this very House, we declared at that time that India would use atomic energy only for peaceful purpo,ses. Late Mrs. Indira Gandhi also said several times that uvea if Pakistan possesses a bomb. India will not go in for a bomb. Since Pakistan is almost on the verge Q| making a bomb, a thinking has started in our country, whether it would be expedient for India to go in for a bomb.

During the last Defence Ministry's budget, it was stated in the report that Pakistan is going to acquire nuclear weapons. It was also stated that in view of Pakistan's attempt to have a nuclear bomb, India will have to rethink its strategy about the nuclear bomb.

Iii the present relation of balance of forces in the whole world, it is a pqint even if Pakistan gets a bomb what use they can put it to. They can blackmail us by acquiring a few 793 RS—7

more bombs. Now, having a nucl«*r bomb is not the end of the game- A* I said earlier, we are living with 50,000 warheads in the world. There are different types of warheads. Once we go into this race there is no end to it. Today, we will be having a nuclear bomb. Tomorrow we will be having another nuclear device. Day-after-tomorrow we will be having another device. We are all aware that the U.S.A. is now experimenting with star wars. They are not satisfied with only nuclear bombs and other warheads. This is a mad race that is going on throughout the world on the atomic weapons.

Ours being a developing country where basic problem^ lik$_e$ illiteracy, health service, housing facilities and even supply of drinking water *remained* unsolved, whether it will be expedient for us to divert our huge sums of money for preparing the atom bomb. This should be considered in depth. When it was known that Pakistan i.s going to have a bomb, our Government spokesmen are making certain statements which are creating a confusing situation in our country. When the last Defence budget was presented in this House, some statements by different spokesmen of the Government were also made. One of our esteemed colleagues has also pointed out that our Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi has aho made contradictory statements in regard to acquiring a bomb in the event of Pakistan going in for a bomb. The other day our Honourable Minister who is sitting here also ptated that our options are open. That is all right. But these types of contradictory statements and actions will lead to the. creation of bomb lobby in our counltry. If pressures develop from within our country *ha< India should go in for a bomb, I think that will be devastating for our country, that will be ruinotu *tor* our country. If Pakistan is having a bomb, India need not be overawed by it. In the present situation of correlated forces the world over it

[SHRI SUKOMAL SEN] will be very difficult for Pakistan to blackmail India by having a bomb or two. This problem hag to be discussed in the proper perspective. We should not take a decision in a hurry. We have been pursuing a policy which was enunciated in this Parliament as far back as 1962 and reiterated by our late Prime Minister and repeatedly committed to different nations about non-proliferation of atomic power, although we are not a signatory to the Nuclear Non-Pro[1] iferation Treaty and rightly so because we should keep our options open; we should try experimenting nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. In 1974 itself the Pokaran test in the deserts of Rajasthan proved that India can develop its nuclear capability to the extent that has been developed in other countries. So, where is the necessity for being afraid that Pakistan is having a bomb? We should be prepared with our nuclear research. We should not lag behind other countries in our research activity. Therefore, I feel IJhat instead of creating a bomb lobby, instead of building pressure from within, that India should prepare a bomb, we should still commit ourselves to putting nuclear energy to peaceful purposes. With these words I conclude.

SHRIMATI USHA MALHOTRA (Himachal Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairperson, I rise to call the attention of the Government to a very important issue which is facing the country and posing a grave threat to the country at large. Its security is imperilled. Its stability has been under attack, as we all know. This is the handiwork of certain forces and vested interests within and without the country We are alive to the situation, no doubt. Under such a situation India has all along committed Itself to the ideals of non-alignmetft, to the adherence of those principles of non-interference, non-intervention and peace. Peace, as we all know, is what every nation has to learn for, more so the developing nations. We in India have endeavoured to maintain peace in this region. It is because of the policies pursued by India that there has been peace in this region. Had it been otherwise, there would have come about several theatres of war around us and in such a situation we would have reached a point of no-return, Today, if at all we use this forum, it is to draw the attention of the Government to a grave situation to which, of course, th$_e$ Government is already alive to. I seek no answers because I am aware the Government will not be in a position to spell out the policy in details in national interest here. Yes, I say we had immense faith and we have immense faith, in the non-alignment policy which we have so far pursued. The point is that tranquillity in the region is intertwined with the peace in the world and henc$_e$ our concern for what is happening close on our borders or elsewhere around us, will effect peace efforts elsewhere in the world. We are aware of the fact that across our borders, sophisticated nuclear weapons have been stockpiled, and Pakistan hap *been* helped in this by the USA. The USA hag helped Pakistan in building up a huge pile of these weapons costing around six billion dollars and more are coming in. The question that now arises is why it so chooses to do. Probably, the fact is that it has hurt many a nation to see that India is coming up and India has made big strides in different fields and somehow it has to be kept under check and this is well known. Otherwise, there is no reason why America should rush an unspecified number of weapons like shoulder-fire missiles surface-to-surface missiles, surface-to-air missiles, sidewinder missiles and air-to-air missiles, as Per the American Broadcasting Corporation report quoting the American Intelligence sources. Pakistan has recently tested a nuclear device and electronic trigger^ used only to set off nuclear bombs. Now, it is very clear that either it has a bomb or i that it has been just tested. I would I like to quote front one of the paper* which gave this information, which

.gave this news, earlier and I think everyone would have seen it. It is from the issue of "Hindustan Times" of Delhi. It says-. "Pak successfully testis ni> lear trigger. Bomb capability confirned". We are all awar$_e$ of it$_v$ The , capability.i$_s$.there. But the question is whether it is being used for us ov for someone else. At the moment, the fear is that the way Pakistan has been armed—it has been srisied to the teeth—it does not need any of these things to protect itse'f against any threat from anybody oi any threat from us. This happens only when a country arms itself to attack. This, I think, i$_s$ beyond anybody's .comprehension as to how and when it is going to do it. But we are all aware of the fact that the world opinion has to be built up against acquisition of nuclear power for destruction. India has not lagged behind in this. It ^as used almost every forum in the world to focus attention of the nations of the world to what is happening in this reglon in. I am sure that the Government of India will also take into consideration the fact that the UN has also to be apprised of this situation because, in a situation like this, when the peace-keeping forces- are being maintained by the UN, what is requited to be done is that India should apprise the UN of this development. I feel that the honourable Minister, now having all the detaile of what already has been conveyed to him and what lie already knows about the situation, will be in a position to see that in no way we are away from those policies to which we have committed ourselves all along. We have used the nuclear energy or power for peaceful purpo&e.s and there have been attacks that we are trying, under some pretext or the other, to alarm the people here. I am very much shocked when the Opposition friends and our honourable colleagues sitting across the floor come out with such things. They know that this is wrong, but they speak like this all the same. I am sure that they know in their heart of hearts that the Government is alive to the situation. But there is one thing. Yes, we would like to us$_e$ this forum to focus the attention of the Government and this is precisely what my honourable colleague, Shri J. K. Jain, did by moving this Calling Attention Motion and all the other .friends joined hands. I am very happy that you did that and I am very happy that you joined us in conveying our concern. But I am, sur$_e$ that this concern will not be just over in this debate on this Calling-Attention Motion, but would be conveyed to the forums in the world that the Indian Parliament Member^ stood for peace fop which they have endeavoured so far. But, at the same time; it should be made known that our security is being imperilled! by these things.

Madam, I know that in the national interest, the honourable Minister will not be divulging all the details of the policy, but I want that he should not leave any forum unutilised for building up world opinion in this regard. Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. Bring it to the attention of the world that We have a nuclear threat. Mr. Minister. I think they have repeatedly asked the same questions. We have the legislative business also today.

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: Madam, I understand th$_e$ mood of the House and yours also. (Interruptions) .

I fully share the concern expressed by the hon. Members and must admit that a very useful contribution lias been made to the debate by them this afternoon. I should also like to say at the outset that Government is extremely vigilant and there cannot be any question of any com-placency regarding developments of this type, this kind of nuclear wea-pons development programme of any neighbouring country. The feelings and sentiments of the hon. Members naturally have to be taken into consideration in all such matters, and I

[HRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN]

assure tsc hon. Members that certainly all that has beeu said in this debate, all that has been suggested will receive the very earnest consideration ot Government.

Madam, I should like to mention that Shri J. K. Jain, who initiated this debate ... (Interruptions) If thi$_s$ is the way you can take my speech as spoken.

Let me assure the House that a continuous vigil, as I mentioned in the statement, is a £act and really it is a fact in such $_a$ fashion that it is not possible for us to Say anything m°re about it, as some hon. Members, have already mentioned about it. But I would certainly like to say that we shall not come down to the standards of certain scientists across the borders who have mentioned certain things, and 1 would only mention this that if they feel that they are very much more advanced, then let them remain under that illusion *(Interruptions)*

Madam, we have always made our views very clear on this subject, and we are very confident about our preparedness and we have full confidence in our defence forces. Naturally, you will always find that the security of the country will be foremost in our thoughts, in our actions and in our doings. Madam, we showed our capability in 1974 and we have not like the scientists of scene other countries torn tomed about it. But we want to do all that is necessary. We are doing what is necessary, what should be done. What is necessary to lie done more, I assure the hon. Ministers, Will be done and is being (one. I again say that we are confident of our preparedness. We have *confidence in* our defence forces and we are confident of our defence establishments.

Madam, Shri Jaswant Singh, my friend, has raised a number of points, In. *the* first istance, I would like to mention that he has made repeated references to Hie statements made by the Prime Minister. I Would like to tell him ^hat there i» no contradiction in the Prime Minister's statements. The Prime Minister- has to make statements in certain circumstances at certain points of time in response to certain things sald at that time. It is not that. A statement made now and a statement made after six months cannot be the same. The statement made after six months will be in reaction to the conditions that have changed during this period. The^re is no question of any contradiction in the statement of the hon. Prime Minister and whatever he has said he always had in view the prevailing conditions at the time when he made that statement.

If Pakistan made the bomb, surely it will affect the security environment of this region. We earnestly hope that better sense will prevai oln Pakistan because it would not pay them. If they make the bomb, naturally the options of the other people are also open and that will be destructive. This is all that I have to say in this regard. It is a fact that we have received reports that Pakistan has been getting financial and technical assistance from some countries for its nuclear programme. I agree with Shri Jaswant Singh in what he said about it. We have made it very clear time and again about our policy regarding the nuclear programme and we stand by that policy. At the same time, naturally nobody can close all his Options in this regard.

Shri Jaswant Singh particularly made a reference to Libya's cooperation with Pakistan. No doubt, there were Teports that Pakistan, some years back, had received some 200 tonnes of uranium from Niger through Libya. There were also reports that Libya had provided Pakistan with financial assistance for its nuclear programme. However, no report* of any Libyan assistance has come to our notice in the last few year*.

Shri Jaswant Singh has also mentioned France. I would like to tell the House that France has s«id that they had not made any offer regarding Chashma. 1 do not know if Shri Jaswant Singh has any< special information about it. If he has, he may kindly pass it on to us and we will certainly look into it.

Regarding China, there were reports that when Shri Bhutto had gone to China in 1975, there had been some kind of understanding or cooperation between these two countries. However, we had no information afterwards. The recent information that we have is that China is entirely different from what China had said at that time. As you must have seen in the papers, now the Chinese have, at this moment, have denied and said that at this time they do not want the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the region.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: You won't believe what appeared in the press.

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: I have listened to you very quietly. I hope that you will reciprocate. Again Shri Jaswant Singh said about full-scope safeguards and IAEA safe guards. The hon. Member would know that India has not signed the Non-proliferation treaty and we still ad here to this decision. They were based on the concept of voluntary offers and the privacy of national sovereignty. Subsequently, there was the signing of N.P.T. by some coun tries. The hon. Members would re collect that India has not signed this discriminatory treaty. An attempt has been made to expand the scope of the original concept to embrace all nu clear activities under safeguards. This is only for the non-nuclear weapon States. It is a well-known fact that the nuclear weapon States have not agreed to adhere to the so-cplled concept of the comprehensive and full-scopj& safeguards. Again 'regarding the KPT'..'..

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: The statement made here was that there will be full-scope safeguards on the offer made by France to Pakistan. That was the statement made by the Prime Minister. The distinction that I tried to make and attempted to seek a clarification is that full-scope safeguards would not apply to Pakistan. That is the point. And if the Minister says that it is true. I would agree.

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: Madam, I have made my point clear. Shri Jaswant Singh also wanted to know whether we will participate in forthcoming meeting of the NPT review committee or not. We have never participated in any such committee and nor do we propose to participate even as an observer. Sir.... I am sorry. Madam, when I say 'Sir', it should be deemed as 'Madam'.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Whatever you might say, they might deem it right or wrong in their own way.

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: Madam, it has been mentioned that there is a contradiction between the statement of the Prime Minister and that of the Defence Minister regarding the agreement on nuclear co-operation between the People's Republic of China and Pakistan. Members will recall that Bhutto himself had suggested in his 'Memoirs' that Pakistan had concluded a nuclear co-operation agreement with China. Recently, the Chinese Prime Minister had made the following statement: "We do not engage in nuclear proliferation ourselves nor do we help other countries develop nuclear weapons." On April 4, 1984, a spokesman of the Information Department of the Chinese Foreign Ministry was quoted by the Chinese News agency as having said, "Certain press reports alleging that China has leaked nuclear information to Pakisan were utterly groundless they were sheer fabrication." The Prime Minister and the Defence Minister were referring to these two different pieces of information. Members can draw their own conclusion. Now....

AN HON. MEMBER: Say Madam.

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: Madam....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. I think you should visit this House more often because there are three ladies who sit on this Chair.

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN:: Madam, it is a matter of real concern that Pakistan has been getting massive supply of offensive and sophisticated weapons from the USA. And this has been brought to the notice of the USA Administration at various levels. And even during the Prime Minister's visit the Prime Minister had mentioned this to President Reagan also. President Reagan at that time said that "every effort will be made to discourage Pakistan to pursue its nuclear weapon programme and we will see that this is acceptable to them." But how far they have been able to influence Pakistan is very difficult for me to say at this stage. Madam, I do not understand . why should we under-estimate our capability and our capacity. Therefore, I would only say to the hon. Members that our capacity and our capability should not be un-deterimated. We have our own capacity; we have our own capability. But we do not want to really display it in such a fashion as certain people across the border are doing.

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA; Capability to do what?

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: Capability to answer every stone by a stone.

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA: Bomb by a bomb?

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: I have not used the word 'bomb'.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: You can use weapon. ;

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: I would also like to tell the hon. Members that we did not go to the.USA or Franco to ask for any aid from them; we have never asked for such aid, particularly _____

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: We have not said that we went for any aid. Nobody in the House spoke about it, The point was about the suphisticated weapons being supplied to Pakistan and whether you have drawn the attention to that aspect.

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: I have already said that we have spoken at various levels, including to the President of the USA about the massive supply of arms to Pakistan. ~

I also do not agree that it will be desirable to think of or resort to pre-emptive action on any establishment in any country.

We are continuing our efforts as Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement but it has to be kept in view that Non-Aligued Movement is not a power block. Many countries of this Movement have got their different options, their own views about it. So, the Non-Aligned Movement cannot really force other countries to have a certain line of view or take a certain line of action on any particular subject. I quite agree that people-to-people contact is very necessary, particularly to improve our relations with the neighbouring countries and all possible efforts in this regard are being made. We have been doing everything possible in this regard and in the latest Joint Commission it will be seen that some progress lias been made athough the progress has been painfully very slow. But once progress starts, we are sure that this will continue.

Shri Gurupadaswamy mentioned about 3 options, either we do nothing, or we make a bomb or we ask for a nuclear umbrella. I would say that we have decided on none of these, we shall have our options open. Shri Gurupadaswamy said rightly that the first atom bomb was never tested. That is true. Actually, at that time they had tested only the components and after testing the components, they had come to the conclusion that the bomb will be successful. We have always wished Pakistan, well and we are trying to improve our relations with

Pakistan: we wish them well but basic differences with them on our policy still remain and we hope that better sense will prevail and they will be able to realise that out policy is the best policy not only for India but for the whole region.

It was said that we are lagging behind Pakistan in the nuclear field and I would again say that we would not like to say anything more than this that if they have any such illusion, let them remain under this illusion. As I have already said, our options are open. Regarding Mrs. Gandhi's policy, she was convinced that her policy was the correct policy for the time and. therefore, she had the conviction and again and again she mentioned that she would not allow India to make nuclear weapons. But I suppose times change. With the change of time and change of conditions: nobody can say what is going to happen in the next few days or few months or few years.

Shri Gopalsamy said and it is a fact that Pakistan has been acquiring nuclear weapon components in a clandestine manner. This has been proved by some of the cases. One of their men was apprehended with 50 krytons at Houston and was tried. He was tried and although, the punishment for this crime is normally about 20 years, he was awarded a punishment of only two years, it was then reduced to the period which he had already undergone in jail.

We understand, there are. about 50,000 unclear weapons with the nuclear weapon States. About 90 to 95 per cent of these weapons is with the two Super Powers. So long as these two Super Powers keep these weapons only as a deterrent, so long as these two Super Powers continue the negotiations at Geneva, there is hops that there will be no nuclear holocaust and the world will be safe, from any kind of holocaust.

Shri Reddy mentioned about Pakistan's nuclear activity. We know about it. It is a fact. Pakistan has acquired the capability in regard to enrichment of uranium. They have done it up to 5 per cent. But at the same" time, President Zia has also said that this 5 per cent is not realty suitable for the nuclear weapons. It is not weapon grade, he said. But if they have done i: up to 5 per cent, they can also doit in respect of the remaining 95 per cent which is the weapon grade.

I have already mentioned that Pakistan has been getting massive supply of sophisticated and offensive weapons torn the U. S. A. We also feel that such massive supply is not really required by Pakistan. Of course, every conutry has got the tight to acquire weapons tor its defence purposes. But the quantity which is being acquired by them is more than their legitimate requirements.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY; I have mentioned about the quality of weapons.

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: mentioned 'sophisticated and offensi weapons'. I am afraid, you did not catch my words. What am I to do?

Now, the American view is that conventional weapons are being supplied to Pakistan for two purposes; one, Pakistan is being treated as a frontline State and two, they want to modernise the defence forces of Pakistan. They also feel that the supply of weapons, perhaps, will discourage Pakistan from undertaking a non-peaceful nuclear programme.

Shri Reddy was very keen that I roust disclose all the details. Madam, I, myself do not know all the details. It is very difficult for me....

This is something for the Defence Minister to Know and naturally, the Raksha Mantri knows all this.

THE MINISTER OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (SHRI BUTA SINGH): He also won't disclose.

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: We also would not like to disclose.

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN: This is the greatest revelation of the day.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO (Jammu and Kashmer): Madam, there is a persion proverb which means: 'ignorance is bliss.

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: Some members mentioned that Mr. Nixon has said that he wanted to use the atom bomb at the time of the 1971 war, but it has not been stated against whom. This is a guess.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Mr. Nixon lias given an interview.

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: In the interview, he said, he wanted to use the atom bomb, but he did not say against whom.

SHRIMATI USHA MALHOTRA: India.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Against India only.

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN; This is your inference. This is her inference. It is for you to decide among yourselves.

I have already mentioned about Nazirs case that he was indicted for smuggling out 50 krytons. Actually, the indictment was there, he should have been punished severely, but he got very light punishment.

Shri' Dhabe mentioned about Kahutu establishment. The Kahuta establishment is there. In the first instance its existance was denied and kept secret, but we all know that the Kahuta establishment is there and it is being used for enrichment of uranium.

As regards the Delhi Declaration, this is our policy and the Delhi Declaration is really the policy which we have been propagating and we have been trying to build up public opinion not only in this country but in the world about the nuclear weapons' use and discouragement of the nuclear weapons arms race. Unfortunately this arms race is continuing unabaied.

SHRI S. W. DHABE; No impact on Pakistan.

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN. Shri Sen. of course, mentioned that there are many useful things which we can do regarding education, health and other things instead of spending money on making bombs and other things. I think he has got his own opinion, other members have got their own opinion and well[1] the Government has got its own option.

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN: Mr. Minister, make your position clear. What are you going to do?

SHRI KHURSHID ALAM KHAN: *I* You would not like me to tell all the secrets. Now, Madam, the only lady mem ber who spoke, appreciated our policy and I thank her very much and I know she has always been appreciating cur policy.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: IS there any pressure on the Minister to songrnti:)ati her?

THE STATE FINANCIAL CORPORATIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985— Conid.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Further debate on the State Financial Corporations (Amendment) Bill. 1985. Shri Virendar Verma.

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : आदरणीय उपसभापति महोदया, राज्य वित्तीय निगम अधिनियम में जो आवश्यक संशोधन माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी लाए हैं मैं उनका स्वागत करता हूं। पिछले 35 वर्ष के निगमों के तजर्बे को देखते हुए इन निगमों की फंक्शनिंग में सुधार की आवश्यकता है, मैं ऐसा महसूस करता हूं। निहित स्वार्थ जिसे वेस्टेड इंट्रेस्ट कहते हैं वे पैदा हो गये हैं, हो भी जाते हैं। पुराने जो उद्योगपति हैं वे विभिन्न प्रकार के सोर्सेज से कर्ज लेते रहते हैं प्राथमिकता के आधार पर इन निगमों से भी उन्हीं को कर्ज मिलता है जो नये उद्योग लगाने वाले हैं उनको कर्ज मिलने में बहुत कठिनाई होती है। दुख की बात यह है कि इन निगमों का ऋण का बकाया 1977 में 92 करोड़ था और 1982 में यह बढ़ कर 267 करोड़ रुपया हो गया। यह आंकड़ा अच्छे नहीं है। इन निगमों द्वारा जिन उद्योगों को ऋण दिये गये उन में से 83911 उद्योग